

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please insert amend the drawing sheets of FIGS. 1 and 2 to insert the words -- Background Art -- as indicated in the replacement drawings submitted herewith, with respect to FIGS. 1 and 2.

NOV 17 2006

REMARKS**I. Claim Objections**

The Examiner indicated that the numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126, which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. The Examiner stated that when claims are cancelled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered, and that when new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively, beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented.

To this end, the Examiner has cancelled claims 13-20 and submitted new claims 21-27 by the amendments herein. It is believed that such amendments correct the issues the Examiner raised above regarding 37 CFR 1.126

The Examiner noted that claim 15 should depend from claim 10 and not from claim 1. The Applicant has cancelled claim 15 by amendment, thereby rendering the objection to claim 15 moot.

The Examiner also noted that claim 19 should read:

"The system of claim 10 wherein..."

The Applicant has cancelled claim 19, thereby rendering the objection to claim 19 moot.

The Applicant submits that the objection to claim 20 is also rendered moot in light of the amendments submitted herein.

II. Drawings

The Examiner indicated that Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as -- Background Art -- . Applicant is therefore submitting herewith

corrected drawing sheets, which the Applicant believes corrects any issues raised by the Examiner regarding the drawings.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10, 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunzinger (U.S. Patent No. 6,931,529) in view of Maung (U.S. Patent No. 6,981,200).

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner argued that Kunzinger teaches:

- A method for end-to-end data protection in a computer, comprising:
- associating a virtual end-to-end address with said data integrity field, wherein said virtual end-to-end address transfers encoded information to a controller through at least one address of a read and write request thereof, wherein said encoded information identifies an offending entity within said data path.

The Examiner cited col. 11, lines 10-60 of Kunzinger in support of this argument.

The Examiner admitted that Kunzinger does not teach:

- associating a data integrity field with data transferred along a data path in a computer.

The Examiner argued that Maung (asserting that this is an "analogous art") teaches "interconnect system with error correction" disclosing:

- associating a data integrity field with data transferred along a data path in a computer.

The Examiner cited FIG. 2 of Maung in support of this argument and asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kunzinger with the teaching of Maung to include data integrity field (arguing "error correction") with data transferred through data links. The Examiner argued that this modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of

ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the need to repair and correct data in the link I/O path.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner asserted that Kunzinger teaches:

-- The method of claim 1 wherein said controller comprises a memory controller of said computer.

The Examiner cited FIG. 1 and reference numeral 12 of Kunzinger in support of this argument.

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner argued that Kunzinger teaches:

-- The method of claim 1 further comprising locating a buffer address within a local memory associated with said controller.

The Examiner cited FIG. 1 and reference numeral 12 of Kunzinger in support of this argument.

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner argued that claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as per claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner argued that claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as per claim 2.

Regarding claim 18, the Examiner argued that claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as per claim 8.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment and notes that claim 1 as amended now incorporates the step of configuring said virtual end-to-end address to further comprise at least one index and at least offset, wherein said at least one index and said at least one offset can each be varied in size to match a requirement of said controller of said computer. Applicant submits that this step is not taught, suggested nor disclosed by Kunzinger and/or Maung, individually or in combination with one another. As such, the Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended overcomes the aforementioned rejection to claim 1 and hence claims 2-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103. Regarding claim 10, the Applicant notes that claim 10 as

amended now includes the claim limitation of wherein said virtual end-to-end address comprises at least one end-to-end bit, which is recognizable by said controller. Such claim limitations are not taught, suggested nor disclosed by Kunzinger and/or Maung, alone or in combination with one another. Regarding the rejection to claims 13-20, the Applicant notes that claims 13-20 have been cancelled by amendment, thereby rendering the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 to claims 13-20 moot. Further, the Applicant submits that because claim 10 as amended is now in an allowable format, any claims that depend upon claim 10 should also be allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the aforementioned rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 3-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3, for example, was indicated as being allowable. There are no intervening claims between claim 3 and claim 1 because claim 3 depended directly from claim 1. Claim 3 has been cancelled and the prior claim limitations of claim 3 incorporated by amendment into claim 1. The Examiner indicated that the step of configuring said virtual end-to-end address to further comprise at least one end-to-end bit, which is recognizable by said controller is not taught by the prior art. Thus, claim 1 as amended is now in an allowable format. The Applicant therefore submits that any claims, which depend from claim 1 should also be allowable. Thus, the Applicant submits that claims 2-9 should also be allowed.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicants have responded to each and every rejection of the Official Action. The Applicants have clarified the

structural distinctions of the present invention. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on the preceding remarks and documents submitted herewith. Reconsideration and allowance of Applicants' application is also respectfully solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned representative to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: November 17, 2006

Kermit Lopez
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,953
ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC
P.O. Box 4484
Albuquerque, NM 87196-4484